IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)	
Application Serial Number	09/594,332
Confirmation Number	8527
Filing Date	06/15/2000
Title of Application	Multiple Site Automated Logout
First Named Inventor	Ryan W. Battle
Assignee	Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit	2445
Examiner	Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Attorney Docket Number	MS1-0826US

To: **Mail Stop: APPEAL BRIEFS – PATENTS**
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

From: Colin D. Barnitz (Tel. 512-505-8162 x5002; Fax 509-323-8979)
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
601 W Riverside Ave, Suite 1400
Spokane, WA 99201

Customer Number 22801

APPEAL BRIEF

This appeal is taken from the rejection of pending claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42, as set forth in the Office Action dated March 25, 2009. Appellant addresses the following items.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this application is the assignee of record, Microsoft Corporation of Redmond, Washington, USA.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant and Appellant's representative are not aware of any related prior or pending appeals, judicial proceedings or interferences which may be related to, directly affect, or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 are currently pending. Claims 2-5, 16, 17, 29, 30, 37 and 38 have been canceled. All of pending claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 stand rejected and have been at least twice rejected. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 is being appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to the rejection of the pending claims by the Office Action mailed March 25, 2009.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 24, 31 and 42 are independent claims. A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each independent claim is provided below by referring to the specification by page and line number and, where applicable, to the drawings by reference character, to guide the Board in its understanding of the claimed subject matter. However, Appellant respectfully notes that additional support for the claims is provided throughout the specification and drawings, and is not limited to that provided in this concise summary.

A. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) the method comprising: providing a first cookie (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6) to a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6); receiving one or more second cookies at the browser (e.g. FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28) as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28); selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17); as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4) based on the list

maintained with the first cookie (e.g., page 11, lines 18-20); in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout (e.g., page 12, lines 5-12 and 17-22); in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9), wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication by selection of the single logout link (e.g., page 11, lines 8-9 and 16-17).

B. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 7

Independent Claim 7 is directed to a computer readable storage medium (e.g., FIG. 1, items 104, 108, 110) having a program stored thereon for causing a computer (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) to implement a method of logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) user out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) the method comprising: providing a first cookie (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6) to a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6); receiving one or more second cookies at the browser (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28) as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28); selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is

contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17); as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4) based on the list maintained with the first cookie (e.g., page 11, lines 18-20); in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, cookie setting information and an image to the browser which is indicative of a successful logout (e.g., page 12, lines 5-12 and 17-22); in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies based on the cookie setting information (e.g. page 12, lines 5-9).

C. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 10

Independent Claim 10 is directed to a method of logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) comprising: receiving one or more cookies at a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28), wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28); requesting a logout page via the browser (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17), wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the user (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24); providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication (e.g., page 11, lines 18-25; page 12,

lines 1-4); calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4 and lines 17-22); sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5 and 17-22), the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9).

D. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 11

Independent Claim 11 is directed to a system for logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) user out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) comprising: one or more processors (e.g., FIG. 1, item 102); one or more computer readable storage media (e.g., FIG. 1, items 104, 108, 110) coupled to the one or more processors, wherein the one or more processors are configured to execute modules including: a first module providing a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system that receives one or more cookies as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28), wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28), wherein the browser issues a request for a logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17), wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24) by an authentication server (e.g., FIG. 2, item 210; FIG. 3, item 320); and a second module that provides a link to an expire

cookies page on each affiliated server (e.g., page 11, lines 18-23) that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser (e.g., page 11, lines 24-25 and page 12, lines 1-4), the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9), wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser from an associated one of the affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28), and wherein the data contains at least one of: a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server (e.g., page 9, line 30), and a profile for the user (e.g., page 9, line 31).

E. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 15

Independent Claim 15 is directed to a computer readable storage medium (e.g., FIG. 1, items 104, 108, 110) having a program stored thereon for causing a computer (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) to implement a method of logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340), comprising: receiving a request for a logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 17-21) via a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24), wherein following the authentication, cookies are provided to the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28), wherein the cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28);

providing a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user (e.g., page 11, lines 18-22) that when called by the browser as a result of requesting the logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27; page 12, lines 1-4), causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22), the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22).

F. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 18

Independent Claim 18 is directed to a method of logging out of affiliated domain servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) on a network (e.g., FIG. 2, item 202), the method performed by a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) implemented on a computer (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200), the method comprising: receiving one or more cookies at the browser as a user visits sites on the affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28) following an authentication of the user by an authentication server (e.g., FIG. 2, item 210; FIG. 3, item 320), wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from the authentication server e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28); requesting a logout page from the authentication server by selecting a logout link (e.g., page 11, lines 16-18), wherein the logout link is on at least one site on the affiliated domain servers that a user of the browser has visited following the authentication (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24); receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of

the logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 18-27; FIG. 3, item 350); in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4 and 17-22); receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in response to the get image requests (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22), the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 19-22); and rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27; page 12, lines 10-12 and 19-22).

G. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 24

Independent Claim 24 is directed to a method of logging a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) comprising: receiving one or more cookies at a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user (e.g., FIG. 3 and page 10, lines 24-28), the cookies containing data provided to the browser from an authentication server (e.g., FIG. 2, item 210; FIG. 3, item 320); requesting a logout page, wherein a logout link for the logout page is on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24); providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link

being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4 and 17-22); calling each link by the browser in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27; page 12, lines 1-4 and 17-22); in response to the calling of each link, sending cookie setting information with an image sent to the browser by each affiliated server having a site that the user has visited following the authentication to clear cookies on the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22), the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22).

H. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 31

Independent Claim 31 is directed to a method of generating a logout page (e.g., FIG. 3, item 350) for display on a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) used to log a user of a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340), the method comprising: obtaining a visited sites data file (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6) which identifies each affiliated server logged into having a site visited following an authentication of the user (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6); generating a plurality of image tags based on the visited sites data file, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers (e.g., page 11, lines 18-23); providing a URL in each image tag (e.g., page 12, lines 3-4) that causes an affiliated server associated with the image tag to clear cookies from the browser by sending cookie setting information for changing settings of the cookies to cause the cookies to be deleted by the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9), the cookie setting information being sent to the browser with an image sent to the browser by the corresponding affiliated

server in response to receipt of an image fetch request sent by the browser when the browser encounters the image tag (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22), wherein the cookies deleted include data provided to the browser from an associated one of the affiliated servers (e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28), and generating the logout page by the browser by including the images received by the browser from the affiliated servers in the logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27).

I. Summary of the Subject Matter of Independent Claim 42

Independent Claim 42 is directed to a method of logging a computer system (e.g., FIG. 2, item 200) user out of affiliated servers (e.g., FIG. 2, items 204-208; FIG. 3, items 330, 340) comprising steps of: authenticating a user to visit sites on the affiliated servers by an authentication server (e.g., FIG. 2, item 210; FIG. 3, item 320) associated with the affiliated servers (e.g., page 9, lines 23-27); providing a first cookie (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6) to a browser (e.g., FIG. 3, item 310) being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user (e.g., page 10, lines 1-6), wherein as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers are stored by the browser e.g., page 10, lines 11-14 and 24-28); selecting, by the user via the browser, a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any site that the user has visited on the affiliated servers or the authentication server following the authentication (e.g., page 11, lines 16-17; page 12, lines 23-24); receiving the selection of the logout link at the authentication server (e.g., page 11, lines 16-21); generating a plurality of image tags

based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers (e.g., page 11, lines 18-22); providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser (e.g., page 11, lines 18-21 and 24-27); rendering the logout page on the browser of the user (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27); in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page by the browser, generating a plurality of image requests by the browser during rendering of the logout page based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4 and 17-22), each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers (e.g., page 11, lines 18-22 and page 12, lines 17-22); sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server (e.g., page 12, lines 1-4 and 17-22) that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22); in response to sending the image requests, receiving at the browser from each affiliated server receiving the image request, an image identified by the image request and cookie setting information (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22); changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser (e.g., page 12, lines 5-9 and 17-22), wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication (e.g., page 11, lines 8-9 and 16-17); completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating

the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page (e.g., page 11, lines 24-27; page 12, lines 10-12 and 19-22).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are:

Whether Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bladow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,040 – hereafter "Bladow") in view of Lu (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,918 – hereafter "Lu").

VII. ARGUMENT

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 AND 39-42 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A)

A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejections of Independent Claims 1 and 7 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claims 1 and 7. As will be shown below, the Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claims 1 and 7, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claims 1 and 7, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claims.

Appellant's Independent Claim 1 reads as follows (with emphasis added):

> 1. A method of logging a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers, the method comprising:
>
> ***providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user;***

receiving one or more second cookies at the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers;

selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers;

as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie;

in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout;

in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information, wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication by selection of the single logout link.

In the Office Action mailed March 25, 2009 (hereinafter "the Office Action"), the Examiner asserts at page 6, line 22, through page 7, line 7, of the Office Action that the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 1 are taught by Bladow at column 17, lines 42-49. However, Appellant notes that the portion of Bladow cited by the Examiner as allegedly teaching the above-emphasized clauses of Claim 1 actually reads as follows:

> When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344. The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450. The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform (Bladow, col. 17, lines 42-49).

1. Bladow combined with Lu fail to teach or suggest "as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie"

According to Appellant's Claim 1, when the logout link is selected, then, as a result of the selecting, the browser issues a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers. For example, when the logout link is selected, a logout webpage may be prepared based on the list maintained with the first cookie, and the logout webpage may be downloaded to the user's browser. Rendering of the logout webpage by the browser (e.g., encountering image tags during rendering) causes the browser to issue requests for data (e.g., images) to the affiliated servers. (See, e.g., page 11, line 16, through page 12, line 16 of Appellant's specification.) Appellant's specification further describes the following:

> One aspect of the invention involves tricking the browser to think it is fetching image source from the domains. The browser is simply issuing separate requests for images to each visited affiliated server. The affiliated servers believe that they are returning just an image, but also send the set cookie header along with the checkmark which causes the browser to delete the desired cookies (Specification, page 12, lines 17-22).

The Examiner asserts that the clause "***as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie***" is taught by the foregoing reproduced portion of Bladow (i.e., col. 17, lines 42-49). However, Appellant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Bladow describes nothing more than that "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (Bladow, col.

17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (Bladow, col. 17, lines 43-45). From a review of the foregoing reproduced portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests ***as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 1. Instead, Appellant respectfully asserts that Bladow describes nothing more than that a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server.

The Examiner further asserts in the *Response to Arguments* at page 2, lines 17-20, of the Office Action that "The request for data from the affiliated servers is taught *when the Web server requests logoff*" (emphasis added). However, Appellant respectfully notes that the above-emphasized clause of Claim 1 at issue clearly states that ***the browser*** issues the request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers, not a Web server, as intimated by the Examiner in the *Response to Arguments* quoted above. Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie***. The Examiner has failed to show any correlation between the cited portion of Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 1. As will be discussed below, Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above in teaching this clause of Appellant's Claim 1. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and the other art of record for this feature.

2. Bladow combined with Lu fail to teach or suggest "in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout"

Further, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow fails to teach or suggest, ***in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout***, as also recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 1. At page 7, lines 1-3, of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the above-emphasized clause is also taught by Bladow at column 17, lines 42-49 of Bladow.

However, Appellant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Bladow clearly states that "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or in the remainder of Bladow of ***sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 1. Instead, Bladow merely

describes that a logoff status is sent to the Web server, which returns the status to the client platform. Thus, Appellant has been unable to locate any discussion in Bladow regarding sending cookie setting information to the browser of a user. Appellant has further been unable to discern any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests sending an image which is indicative of successful logout to the browser of a user.

Since, as pointed out above in the previous section, Bladow does not teach or suggest issuing, by the browser, a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers, Bladow also does not teach or suggest that the affiliated servers respond to the request for data from the browser by sending to the browser cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout. Thus, Bladow also fails to teach or suggest ***in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout,*** as recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 1. As will be discussed below, Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and the other art of record for the elements of this clause as well.

3. Bladow combined with Lu fail to teach or suggest "in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information"

Bladow further fails to teach or suggest ***in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information***, as also recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 1. The Examiner asserts that this clause is also taught at column 17, lines 42-49 of Bladow.

However, from a review of the cited portion of Bladow, as set forth above, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests storing cookies on the browser of a user or clearing cookies from the browser of a user. Instead, Appellant notes that Bladow uses a separate cookiejar server 1352 for storing cookies. For example, Bladow discusses that "The Web server 1344, the dispatcher 1346, *cookiejar server 1352*, and StarOE server 1348 are typically located *at the enterprise site*" (col. 15, lines 65-67 – emphasis added). Bladow further discusses that "The *cookiejar 1352 is a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server* 1348" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). Bladow further discusses that "When a connection is established with the cookiejar 1352, the Web server 1344 makes a request for the entitlements for a given session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 13-15). "The *cookiejar 1352 goes through its stored list of cookies, identifies the cookie for the session and returns the cookie to the Web server* 1344 also shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 15-18 – emphasis added). (See also FIGS. 8 and 9 of Bladow, which show, e.g., the customer 1340 and the separate cookiejar server 1352).

Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no discussion in Bladow of ***clearing cookies from a browser of a user***. Instead, Bladow merely describes a

cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow describes nothing more than a cookiejar server that stores session cookies on itself, and deletes those cookies from itself when the Web server requests logoff for the session. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Bladow has little relevance to Appellant's claims, and Bladow does not teach or suggest ***in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 1. As will be discussed below, Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and the other art of record for the features of this clause as well.

4. Bladow combined with Lu fail to teach or suggest "providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system

being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user"

Bladow further fails to teach or suggest ***providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user***, as also recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 1. The Examiner asserts that this clause of Appellant's Claim 1 is taught at column 16, line 15, through column 17, line 12 of Bladow. However, Appellant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Bladow merely discusses, for example, that "The cookiejar 1352 is a repository for various customer sessions and each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server 1348" (Bladow, col. 16, lines 57-60). Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow describes nothing more than that the cookiejar server 1352 stores cookies on itself for various customer sessions (e.g., Bladow, col. 16, lines 57-60), and deletes those cookies when instructed by the Web server (col. 17, lines 42-49). As will be discussed below, Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that Claim 1 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and the other art of record for the elements of this clause as well.

Appellant has shown above by **direct quotation** that the cited portions of Bladow and the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 1 are very different on their faces. For example, it is apparent that there is no discussion in the cited portions of Bladow of a browser or clearing cookies from a browser. Further, there is no

teaching or suggestion in the cited portions Bladow of affiliated servers that, in response to the request for data issued by the browser, send to the browser cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout, or clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of the browser, the cookie setting information, the image, and other elements of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 1.

5. Lu fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. For example, at page 7, lines 11-12 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Bladow fails to "disclose the use of an image to verify logout had been completed." At page 7, lines 12-14 of the Office Action, Lu is cited as disclosing "the ability to send a confirmation from a service provider upon logout from a web page to a pager," citing to Lu, column 3, lines 21-31. The cited portion of Lu (col. 3, lines 21-31) reads as follows (emphasis added):

> The pager output includes the service request and associated data identifying station 14a as the requesting station and is sent by interface 40 to a pager service. In turn, the pager service activates pager 42 to display the service request and associated data. *The server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages.* Through this system, a service provider can indicate availability for providing video conferencing services. *Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends a pager notification to the service provider for confirmation.*

From a review of the cited portion of Lu set forth above, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests ***in***

response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout, as recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 1. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31 – emphasis added). Appellant respectfully notes that these portions of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, appear to be of little relevance to Appellant's Claims, including the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 1. For example, sending a pager notification to a service provider is not the same as sending cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout to a browser of a user.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu fails to teach or suggest ***providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user***, as recited in Appellant's claim 1. Bladow combined with Lu further fails to teach or suggest ***as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie***, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 1. Bladow combined with Lu further fails to teach or suggest ***in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout***, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 1. Bladow

combined with Lu further fails to teach or suggest, ***in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information***, as also recited in Appellants Claim 1.

The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above. Accordingly, insofar as that the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 1, and insofar as that the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 1, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 1. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of Appellant's Independent Claim 1, as discussed above. For example, as demonstrated above by direct quotation, the cited portions of Bladow and Lu fail to teach or suggest a browser, providing a first cookie to a browser, receiving cookie setting information, receiving an image, clearing cookies from a browser, and numerous other elements of Appellant's Claim 1.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that teaches or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth, it follows that the Examiner is inadvertently

interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Claim 1 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 1 and hold Independent Claim 1 allowable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 7 includes language similar to that discussed above with respect to Claim 1, and is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record under a similar rationale. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 7, and hold Independent Claim 7 allowable over the art of record.

B. Rejection of Independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claim 10 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejections of Independent Claim 10 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 10. As will be shown by the following, the Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claim 10, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claim 10, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of

the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claim 10.

Appellant's Independent Claim 10 includes the following (with emphasis added):

> ...receiving one or more cookies at a browser on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers;
>
> requesting a logout page via the browser, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the user;
>
> ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication;***
>
> ***calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server;***
>
> ***sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.***

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts at page 8, lines 17-22, that the clauses ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication*** and ***calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server*** are taught by Bladow at column 17, lines 42-49.

The cited portion of Bladow has already been reproduced above in part A of this section with respect to the arguments discussing the rejections of Claims 1 and 7. From a review of the cited portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any teaching or suggestion in Bladow regarding ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication***, or ***calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 10. Instead, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication***, or ***calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 10 For example, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of

an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, or calling the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server during rendering of the logout page by the browser. The Examiner has failed to show any correlation between the cited portion of Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clauses Appellant's Claim 10. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for these shortcomings in Bladow. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asserts that Claim 10 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and the other art of record for this feature.

Further, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow fails to teach or suggest, ***sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies***, as also recited in Appellant's Independent Claim 10. At page 7, lines 1-3, of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the above-emphasized clause is also taught at column 17, lines 42-49 of Bladow. However, as pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. For example, at page 9, lines 1-2, of the Office Action, with respect to the rejection of claim 10, the Examiner states that Bladow fails to "disclose the use of an image to verify logout had been completed." Further, at page 9, lines 2-4 of the Office Action, Lu is cited as disclosing "the ability to send a confirmation from a service provider upon logout from a web page to a pager," citing to Lu, column 3, lines 21-31. However, Appellant respectfully notes that **there is NO image** recited in Appellant's Claim 10. Further, from a review of the cited portion of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Independent Claim 10. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31 – emphasis added). Appellant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Lu and the remainder of Lu appear to be of little relevance to Appellant's Claim 10. For example, Lu alone or combined with Bladow, still does not teach or suggest a browser, a link to an expired cookies page, calling the link by the browser during rendering of the logout page, and other features of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Independent Claim 10.

Appellant has shown above by direct quotation that the cited portions of Bladow and Lu are very different on their faces from the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 10. For example, it is apparent that there is no mention in the cited portions of Bladow and Lu of a browser, a link to an expired cookies page, calling the

link by the browser during rendering of the logout page, and other elements of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 10. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of these features in the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 10. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu fails to teach or suggest ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 10. Bladow combined with Lu further fails to teach or suggest ***calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server***, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 10. Bladow combined with Lu further fails to teach or suggest, ***sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookie***s, as also recited in Appellants Claim 10.

The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above. Accordingly, insofar as the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 10, and insofar as the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 10, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 10. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence

or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of Appellant's Independent Claim 10, as discussed above.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that shows or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth above, it follows that the Examiner is inadvertently interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Independent Claim 10 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Independent Claim 10 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 10 and hold Independent Claim 10 allowable over the art of record.

C. Rejection of Independent Claims 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claims 11 and 15 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejections of Independent Claims 11 and 15 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claims 11 and 15. As will be shown by the following, the

Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claims 11 and 15, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claims 11 and 15, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claims 11 and 15.

Appellant's Independent Claim 11 includes the following (with emphasis added):

> …one or more processors;
>
> one or more computer readable storage media coupled to the one or more processors, wherein the one or more processors are configured to execute modules including:
>
> a first module providing a browser on the computer system that receives one or more cookies as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers, wherein the browser issues a request for a logout page, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user by an authentication server; and
>
> ***a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies,***
>
> wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser from an associated one of the affiliated servers, and
>
> wherein the data contains at least one of:
>
> a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server, and
>
> a profile for the user.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts at page 10, lines 4-9, that the clause ***a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies,*** is taught by Bladow at column 17, lines 42-49.

The cited portion of Bladow has already been reproduced above in part A of this section with respect to the arguments discussing the rejections of Claims 1 and 7. From a review of the cited portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any teaching or suggestion in Bladow regarding ***a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 11. Instead, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344,

which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 11. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between the cited portion of Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11.

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. For example, at page 10, lines 16-17, of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Bladow fails to "disclose the use of an image to verify logout had been completed." Further, at page 10, lines 17-19 of the Office Action, Lu is cited as disclosing "the ability to send a confirmation from a service provider upon logout from a web page to a pager," citing to column 3, lines 21-31 of Lu. However, Appellant respectfully notes that **there is NO image** recited in Appellant's Claim 11. Further, from a review of the cited portion of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Independent Claim 11. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31). Appellant respectfully notes that this portion of Lu and the remainder of Lu appear to be

of little relevance to Appellant's claims. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu fails to teach or suggest ***a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 11. The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above.

Appellant has shown above by direct quotation that the cited portions of Bladow and Lu are very different on their faces from the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11. For example, it is apparent that there is no mention in the cited portion of Bladow of a browser, a link to an expired cookies page, causing each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser, and other elements of the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of these elements in the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11. Accordingly, insofar as the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11, and insofar as the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 11, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 11. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of

Appellant's Independent Claim 11, as discussed above. For example, as demonstrated above by direct quotation, the cited portions of Bladow and Lu fail to teach or suggest a browser, a link to an expired cookies page, calling the link by the browser, and other features of the above-emphasized clause of Appellant's Claim 11.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that teaches or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this, and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth above, it follows that the Examiner is inadvertently interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Independent Claim 11 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 11 and hold Independent Claim 11 allowable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 15 includes clauses having language similar to that discussed above with respect to Claim 11, and is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record under a similar rationale. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing

reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 15, and hold Independent Claim 15 allowable over the art of record.

D. Rejection of Independent Claims 18 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claims 18 and 31 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejections of Independent Claims 18 and 31 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claims 18 and 31. As will be shown by the following, the Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claims 18 and 31, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claims 18 and 31, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claims 18 and 31.

Appellant's Independent Claim 18 includes the following (with emphasis added):

> ...receiving one or more cookies at the browser as a user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user by an authentication server, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from the authentication server;
>
> requesting a logout page from the authentication server by selecting a logout link, wherein the logout link is on at least one site on the affiliated domain servers that a user of the browser has visited following the authentication;
>
> ***receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;***

in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags;

receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in response to the get image requests, the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information; and

rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts at page 12, lines 5-10, that the clauses ***receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;*** and ***in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags***, are taught by Bladow at column 17, lines 42-49.

The cited portion of Bladow has already been reproduced above in part A of this section with respect to the arguments discussing the rejections of Claims 1 and 7. From a review of the cited portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any teaching or suggestion in Bladow regarding ***receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;*** or ***in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 18. Instead, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is a

repository for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;*** or ***in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 18. For example, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of image tags, rendering of a logout page, issuing get image requests, or other features of the above-emphasized clauses. The Examiner has failed to show any correlation between the cited portion of Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clauses Appellant's Claim 18.

Furthermore, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of ***receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in***

response to the get image requests, the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information; or ***rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser***, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 18. The Examiner asserts that these clauses are also taught by Bladow, again citing column 17, lines 47-49. However, as pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. For example, at page 12, lines 21-22 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Bladow failed to disclose the use of an image to verify logout had been completed." Further, at page 13, lines 1-3 of the Office Action, Lu is cited as disclosing "the ability to send a confirmation from a service provider upon logout from a web page to a pager," citing to Lu, column 3, lines 21-31. However, from a review of

the cited portion of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Independent Claim 18. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31). Appellant respectfully notes that this portion of Lu and the remainder of Lu appear to be of little relevance to Appellant's Claims. The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above.

Appellant has shown above by direct quotation that the cited portions of Bladow and Lu are very different on their faces from the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 18. For example, it is apparent that there is no mention in the cited portion of Bladow of a browser, image tags, receiving cookie setting information, and other features of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 18. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of these features in the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 18. Accordingly, insofar as the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 18, and insofar as the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 18, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 18. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence

or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of Appellant's Independent Claim 18, as discussed above.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that teaches or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this, and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth above, it follows that the Examiner is inadvertently interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Claim 18 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 18 and hold Claim 18 allowable over the art of record.

Independent Claim 31 includes clauses having language similar to that discussed above with respect to Claim 18, and is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record under a similar rationale. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 31, and hold Claim 31 allowable over the art of record.

E. Rejection of Independent Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claim 24 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejection of Independent Claim 24 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 24. As will be shown by the following, the Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claim 24, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claim 24, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claim 24.

Appellant's Independent Claim 24 includes the following (with emphasis added):

> ...receiving one or more cookies at a browser on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, the cookies containing data provided to the browser from an authentication server;
>
> requesting a logout page, wherein a logout link for the logout page is on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user;
>
> ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page;***
>
> ***calling each link by the browser in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page;***
>
> ***in response to the calling of each link, sending cookie setting information with an image sent to the browser by each affiliated server having a site that the user has visited following the authentication to clear cookies on the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.***

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts at page 14, lines 5-10, that the clauses ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page;*** and ***calling each link by the browser in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page***, are taught by the combination of Bladow and Lu. In particular, the Examiner asserts that "*Bladow taught a graphical user interface, and Lu taught sending a logout confirmation from a web page upon logout. These two references in combination teach the transmission of image data, which is the equivalent of the image tag limitations herein*" (Office Action, page 14, lines 14-17).

First, Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner appears to not appreciate the distinction between an image tag included in a logout page and an image or image data. (For example, during rendering of a web page by a browser, when an image tag is encountered, the browser sends a request to a URL specified by the image tag to retrieve the corresponding image. Image tags are discussed in Appellant's specification, e.g., at page 11, line 18, through page 12, line 22.) In addition, the Examiner has failed to point to any portion of Bladow that actually teaches a graphical user interface, other than the title of Bladow. Further, whether or not Bladow teaches a graphical user interface is not of particular relevance, as Appellant's claims do not include any recitation of a graphical user interface.

From a review of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any teaching or suggestion in Bladow regarding ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page;*** or ***calling each link by the browser in response to encountering***

the image tags in the logout page, as recited in Appellant's Claim 24. Instead, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page;*** or ***calling each link by the browser in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 24. For example, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of image tags, a logout page, an expire cookies page, or other features of the above-emphasized clauses. The Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clauses Appellant's Claim 24.

Furthermore, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of ***in response to the calling of each link, sending cookie setting information with an image sent to the browser by each affiliated server having a***

site that the user has visited following the authentication to clear cookies on the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 24. The Examiner asserts that this clause is also taught by Bladow, again citing column 17, lines 47-49. However, as pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. Lu is cited as disclosing "sending a logout confirmation from a web page upon logout," citing to Lu, column 3, lines 21-31. However, from a review of the cited portion of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Independent Claim 24. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31). Appellant respectfully notes

that this portion of Lu and the remainder of Lu appear to be of little relevance to Appellant's claims. The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above.

Appellant has shown above by direct quotation that the cited portions of Bladow and Lu are very different on their faces from the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 24. For example, it is apparent that there is no mention in the cited portion of Bladow of a browser, image tags, cookie setting information or other features of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 24. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of these features in the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 24. Accordingly, insofar that the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 24, and insofar as that the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 24, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 24. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of Appellant's Independent Claim 24, as discussed above.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that teaches or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this, and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth above, it follows that the Examiner is

inadvertently interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Claim 24 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 24 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 24 and hold Claim 24 allowable over the art of record.

F. Rejection of Independent Claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claim 42 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. The rejection of Independent Claim 42 should be reversed at least because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 42. As will be shown by the following, the Examiner has ignored express recitations of Independent Claim 42, and the Examiner has provided mere conclusory statements to attempt to meet the recitations of Independent Claim 42, but has not provided any objectively verifiable evidence in support of his interpretation of the cited documents for connecting the cited documents to the language of Appellant's Claim 42.

Appellant's Independent Claim 42 includes the following (with emphasis added):

> ...authenticating a user to visit sites on the affiliated servers by an authentication server associated with the affiliated servers;
>
> ***providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites***

visited by the user following the authentication of the user, wherein as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers are stored by the browser;

selecting, by the user via the browser, a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any site that the user has visited on the affiliated servers or the authentication server following the authentication;

receiving the selection of the logout link at the authentication server;

generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers;

providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser;

rendering the logout page on the browser of the user;

in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page by the browser, generating a plurality of image requests by the browser during rendering of the logout page based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie, each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers;

sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser;

in response to sending the image requests, receiving at the browser from each affiliated server receiving the image request, an image identified by the image request and cookie setting information;

changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication;

completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts at page 19, line 19, through page 21, line 2, that the clauses ***generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers; providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser;*** and ***sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser***, are taught by the combination of Bladow and Lu. In particular, the Examiner asserts that "*Bladow taught a graphical user interface, and Lu taught sending a logout confirmation from a web page upon logout. These two references in combination teach the transmission of image data, which is the equivalent of the image tag limitations herein*" (e.g., Office Action, page 20, lines 5-8).

First, Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner appears to not appreciate the distinction between an image tag and an image or image data. Image tags are discussed in Appellant's specification, for example, at page 11, line 18, through page 12, line 22. In addition, the Examiner has failed to point to any portion of Bladow that actually teaches a graphical user interface, other than the title of Bladow. Further, whether or not Bladow teaches a graphic user interface is not of particular relevance, as Appellant's claims do not include any recitation of such.

From a review of the title of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any teaching or suggestion in Bladow regarding ***generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers; providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser;*** or ***sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 42. Instead, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Thus, Appellant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion here, or elsewhere in Bladow, of ***generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers; providing the image tags***

in a logout page to be rendered by the browser; or ***sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser***, as recited in Appellant's Claim 42. For example, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of image tags, a logout page, an expire cookies page, or other features of the above-emphasized clauses. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of the above-emphasized clauses Appellant's Claim 42.

In addition, Appellant has been unable to locate any teaching or suggestion in Bladow of ***rendering the logout page on the browser of the user;*** or ***in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page by the browser, generating a plurality of image requests by the browser during rendering of the logout page based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie, each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers;*** or ***changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication;*** or ***completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page***, as also recited in Appellant's Claim 42. The Examiner asserts that these clauses are taught by

Bladow, citing column 17, lines 41-49. However, as pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49).

Additionally, Appellant has been unable to locate any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests ***providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user***, as also recited in Appellant's claim 42. The Examiner asserts that this clause of Appellant's Claim 42 is taught at column 16, line 15, through column 17, line 12 of Bladow. However, Appellant respectfully notes that the cited portion of Bladow merely discusses, for example, that "The cookiejar 1352 is a repository for various customer sessions and each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server 1348" (Bladow, col. 16, lines 57-60). From a review of the cited portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests ***providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by***

the user following the authentication of the user, as recited in Appellant's Claim 1. Instead, Bladow describes nothing more than that the cookiejar server stores cookies on itself for various customer sessions (e.g., Bladow, col. 16, lines 57-60).

Lu and/or the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. Lu is cited as disclosing "sending a logout confirmation from a web page upon logout" citing to Lu, column 3, lines 21-31. However, from a review of the cited portion of Lu, and the remainder of Lu, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion that teaches or suggests the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Independent Claim 42. Instead, Lu merely describes that the "server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages" (col. 3, lines 25-27). "Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends *a pager notification to the service provider* for confirmation" (col. 3, lines 29-31). Appellant respectfully notes that this portion of Lu and the remainder of Lu appear to be of little relevance to Appellant's claims. The other art of record fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow and Lu pointed out above.

Appellant has shown above by direct quotation that the cited portions of Bladow and Lu are very different on their faces from the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 42. For example, it is apparent that there is no mention in the cited portion of Bladow of a browser, image tags, cookie setting information or other features of the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 42. The Examiner has ignored the express recitations of these features in the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 42. Accordingly, insofar that the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized clauses of Appellant's Claim 42,

and insofar as that the Examiner has provided no objectively verifiable evidence as to how Bladow and/or Lu could be modified and/or combined to teach at least the above-emphasized clauses of Independent Claim 42, Appellant respectfully points out that the documents cited by the Examiner do not establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability of Independent Claim 42. In addition, the Examiner has failed to present any evidence or explanation that actually connects the cited portions of Bladow and Lu to the express language of Appellant's Independent Claim 42, as discussed above.

Furthermore, given that Appellant has shown above what Bladow and Lu actually recite, Appellant respectfully points out that Appellant's Application is the only objectively verifiable Examiner-cited document of record that teaches or suggests what the Examiner purports Bladow and Lu to teach or suggest. From this, and the express recitations of Bladow and Lu, as set forth above, it follows that the Examiner is inadvertently interpreting Bladow and Lu through the lens of Appellant's Application, which is impermissible hindsight. Thus, the Examiner's assertions regarding Bladow and Lu as teaching Appellant's Independent Claim 42 are untenable, and the cited art of record fails to establish a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 42 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Independent Claim 42 and hold Claim 42 allowable over the art of record.

G. Rejection of Dependent Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 6 includes that ***the second cookies are expired by the browser in response to the cookie setting information to log the user out of the affiliated servers having the sites that the user visited***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 6 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Dependent Claim 6. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 6. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant

respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 6 and hold Dependent Claim 6 allowable over the art of record.

H. Rejection of Dependent Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

No reason for the rejection of Dependent Claim 8 was given in the Office Action. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 8 and hold Dependent Claim 8 allowable over the art of record.

I. Rejection of Dependent Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 9 includes ***wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user by selection of the single logout link***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 9 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns

the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 9. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 9. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 9 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 9 and hold Dependent Claim 9 allowable over the art of record.

J. Rejection of Dependent Claims 12, 22, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claims 12, 22, 23, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 12 includes ***a visited sites cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers that the user has visited following the authentication***. The Examiner asserts that this is taught at column 16, lines 51-67 of Bladow. However, Appellant respectfully asserts that the cited portion of Bladow merely discusses, for example, that "The cookiejar 1352 is a repository for various customer sessions and each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server 1348" (col. 16, lines 57-60). From a review of the cited portion of Bladow, and the remainder of Bladow, Appellant has been unable to discern any portion of Bladow that teaches or suggests ***a visited sites cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers that the user has visited following the authentication***, as recited in Appellant's Dependent Claim 12.

Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 12. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 12. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Dependent Claim 12 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 12 and hold Dependent Claim 12 allowable over the art of record.

Dependent Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 include language similar to that discussed above with respect to Dependent Claim 12, and are allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record under a similar rationale. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26, and hold Dependent Claims 22, 23, 25 and 26 allowable over the art of record.

K. Rejection of Dependent Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 13 includes ***wherein the list of affiliated servers is used to identify the link to each expire cookies page on each affiliated server***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 13 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details*

are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 13. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 13. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Dependent Claim 13 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 13 and hold Dependent Claim 13 allowable over the art of record.

L. Rejection of Dependent Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Claim 14 includes ***wherein the request for a logout page causes the logout page to be rendered by the browser, the logout page directing the browser to link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated***

server. The Examiner asserts that Claim 14 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 14. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 14. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 14 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 14 and hold Claim 14 allowable over the art of record.

M. Rejection of Dependent Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Claim 15 includes ***wherein the images***

comprise an image of a checkmark for indicating successful logout from a corresponding one of the affiliated servers. The Examiner asserts that Claim 19 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 19. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 19. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 19 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 19 and hold Dependent Claim 19 allowable over the art of record.

N. Rejection of Dependent Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Claim 20 includes ***wherein the image tags ensure that the image will not be retrieved from cache.*** The Examiner asserts that Claim 20 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 20. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 20. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 20 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 20 and hold Dependent Claim 20 allowable over the art of record.

O. Rejection of Dependent Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 21 includes ***wherein the image tag includes a query***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 21 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 21. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 21. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 21 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 21 and hold Dependent Claim 21 allowable over the art of record.

P. Rejection of Dependent Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 27 includes ***wherein the logout link is provided on one or more of multiple servers logged into through the affiliated servers, one of the affiliated servers, and the authentication server***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 27 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 27. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 27. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 27 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks

the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 27 and hold Dependent Claim 27 allowable over the art of record.

Q. Rejection of Dependent Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 32 includes ***wherein each image tag contains a query string parameter causing the browser to fetch an image from the affiliated server corresponding to the image tag as a separate image fetching transaction***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 32 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 32. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 32. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant

respectfully submits that Claim 32 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 32 and hold Dependent Claim 32 allowable over the art of record.

R. Rejection of Dependent Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 33 includes ***wherein the request for data from the affiliated servers is issued by the browser during rendering of a logout page on the browser, wherein the logout page is received by the browser as a result of selecting the logout link***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 33 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 33. Further, the Examiner has failed to show

any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 33. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 33 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 33 and hold Dependent Claim 33 allowable over the art of record.

S. Rejection of Dependent Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claim 41 includes ***hosting by each affiliated server a URL used for retiring cookies during logging out of the user; directing the request for data issued by the browser to the URL for retiring cookies for each affiliated server having a site that the user has visited following the authentication; and sending, by the affiliated servers receiving the request, the image and a set cookie header including the cookie setting information for changing the settings of the second cookies for clearing the second cookies.***. The Examiner asserts that Claim 41 is taught by Bladow, citing column 17, lines 42-49, and col. 16, lines 1-52. As pointed out above, Bladow merely describes a cookiejar server 1352 that "is *a repository* for various customer sessions and *each session details are included in a cookie including the entitlement information from the OE server*" (col. 16, lines 57-60 – emphasis added). "When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344" (col. 17, lines 42-43). "The Web

server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450" (col. 17, lines 43-45). "The cookiejar 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie" (col. 17, lines 45-46). "After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform" (col. 17, lines 47-49). Thus, from the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Bladow does not teach or suggest Appellant's Claim 41. Further, the Examiner has failed to show any correlation between Bladow and the language of Appellant's Claim 41. Lu and the other art of record fail to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully submits that Claim 41 is allowable over Bladow, Lu and/or the other art of record, and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of Dependent Claim 41 and hold Dependent Claim 41 allowable over the art of record.

T. Rejection of Dependent Claims 28, 34-36, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent Claims 28, 34-36, 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Dependent Claims 28, 34-36, 39 and 40 are patentable at least because they depend from allowable respective base claims.

XI. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Arguments, Appellant/Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the rejections of Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance.

XII. FEES

Fees will be paid by credit card through the EFS Web; however, Appellant hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency of fees and credit any overpayments, including any fees for extensions of time, to Deposit Account Number 12-0769.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Appellant

/Colin D. Barnitz 35061/ Dated: September 25, 2009
Colin D. Barnitz
(colin@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5002)
Registration No. 35061

Reviewer/Supervisor: Emmanuel A. Rivera
emmanuel@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5001
Registration No. 45760

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method of logging a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers, the method comprising:

providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user;

receiving one or more second cookies at the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers;

selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers;

as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie;

in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout;

in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information, wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication by selection of the single logout link.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein the second cookies are expired by the browser in response to the cookie setting information to log the user out of the affiliated servers having the sites that the user visited.

7. A computer readable storage medium having a program stored thereon for causing a computer to implement a method of logging a user of a computer system user out of affiliated servers, the method comprising:

providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user;

receiving one or more second cookies at the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers;

selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers;

as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie;

in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, cookie setting information and an image to the browser which is indicative of a successful logout;

in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies based on the cookie setting information.

8. The computer readable storage medium of claim 7 wherein the request for data from the affiliated servers is issued by the browser during rendering of a logout page on the browser.

9. The computer readable storage medium of claim 7 wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user by selection of the single logout link.

10. A method of logging a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers comprising:

receiving one or more cookies at a browser on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers;

requesting a logout page via the browser, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the user;

providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication;

calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server;

sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.

11. A system for logging a user of a computer system user out of affiliated servers comprising:

one or more processors;

one or more computer readable storage media coupled to the one or more processors, wherein the one or more processors are configured to execute modules including:

a first module providing a browser on the computer system that receives one or more cookies as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers, wherein the browser issues a request for a logout page, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user by an authentication server; and

a second module that provides a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies,

wherein the cookies include data provided to the browser from an associated one of the affiliated servers, and

wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server, and

a profile for the user.

12. The system of claim 11 further comprising a visited sites cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers that the user has visited following the authentication.

13. The system of claim 12 wherein the list of affiliated servers is used to identify the link to each expire cookies page on each affiliated server.

14. The system of claim 11 wherein the request for a logout page causes the logout page to be rendered by the browser, the logout page directing the browser to link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server

15. A computer readable storage medium having a program stored thereon for causing a computer to implement a method of logging a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers, comprising:

receiving a request for a logout page via a browser on the computer system, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site on the affiliated

servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user, wherein following the authentication, cookies are provided to the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers, wherein the cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding affiliated servers;

providing a link to an expire cookies page on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user that when called by the browser as a result of requesting the logout page, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information to the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.

18. A method of logging out of affiliated domain servers on a network, the method performed by a browser implemented on a computer, the method comprising:

receiving one or more cookies at the browser as a user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user by an authentication server, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from the authentication server;

requesting a logout page from the authentication server by selecting a logout link, wherein the logout link is on at least one site on the affiliated domain servers that a user of the browser has visited following the authentication;

receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;

in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags;

receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in response to the get image requests, the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information; and

rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser.

19. The method of claim 18 wherein the images comprise an image of a checkmark for indicating successful logout from a corresponding one of the affiliated servers.

20. The method of claim 18 wherein the image tags ensure that the image will not be retrieved from cache.

21. The method of claim 18 wherein the image tag includes a query.

22. The method of claim 18 wherein the affiliated domain servers logged into are identified in a visited sites data structure.

23. The method of claim 22 wherein the data structure comprises a visited sites cookie provided to the browser by the authentication server.

24. A method of logging a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers comprising:

receiving one or more cookies at a browser on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, the cookies containing data provided to the browser from an authentication server;

requesting a logout page, wherein a logout link for the logout page is on at least one site on the affiliated servers that the user has visited following an authentication of the user;

providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server, said link being in the form of an image tag included in the logout page;

calling each link by the browser in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page;

in response to the calling of each link, sending cookie setting information with an image sent to the browser by each affiliated server having a site that the user has visited following the authentication to clear cookies on the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.

25. The method of claim 24 wherein a data structure of visited sites is maintained identifying the affiliated servers that are visited by the user following the authentication.

26. The method of claim 25 wherein the data structure is a visited sites cookie provided to the browser by the authentication server.

27. The method of claim 24 wherein the logout link is provided on one or more of multiple servers logged into through the affiliated servers, one of the affiliated servers, and the authentication server.

28. The method of claim 24 wherein the cookies comprise user personal information.

31. A method of generating a logout page for display on a browser used to log a user of a computer system out of affiliated servers, the method comprising:

obtaining a visited sites data file which identifies each affiliated server logged into having a site visited following an authentication of the user;

generating a plurality of image tags based on the visited sites data file, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers;

providing a URL in each image tag that causes an affiliated server associated with the image tag to clear cookies from the browser by sending cookie setting information for changing settings of the cookies to cause the cookies to be deleted by the browser, the cookie setting information being sent to the browser with an image sent to the browser by the corresponding affiliated server in response to receipt of an image fetch request sent by the browser when the browser encounters the image tag,

wherein the cookies deleted include data provided to the browser from an associated one of the affiliated servers, and

generating the logout page by the browser by including the images received by the browser from the affiliated servers in the logout page.

32. The method of claim 31 wherein each image tag contains a query string parameter causing the browser to fetch an image from the affiliated server corresponding to the image tag as a separate image fetching transaction.

33. The method of claim 1, wherein the request for data from the affiliated servers is issued by the browser during rendering of a logout page on the browser, wherein the logout page is received by the browser as a result of selecting the logout link.

34. The computer-readable medium of claim 7, wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server, and

a profile for the user.

35. The method of claim 10, wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server,

a profile for the user, and

a list of sites visited by the user following the authentication, wherein the sites include web servers.

36. The computer-readable medium of claim 15, wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server,

a profile for the user, and

a list of sites visited by the user following the authentication, wherein the sites include web servers.

39. The method of claim 18, wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server,

a profile for the user, and

a list of sites visited by the user following the authentication, wherein the sites include web servers.

40. The method of claim 24, wherein the data contains at least one of:

a date and time that the user is authenticated by an authentication server,

a profile for the user, and

a list of sites visited by the user following the authentication, wherein the sites include web servers.

41. The method according to claim 1, further including steps of:

hosting by each affiliated server a URL used for retiring cookies during logging out of the user;

directing the request for data issued by the browser to the URL for retiring cookies for each affiliated server having a site that the user has visited following the authentication; and

sending, by the affiliated servers receiving the request, the image and a set cookie header including the cookie setting information for changing the settings of the second cookies for clearing the second cookies.

42. A method of logging a computer system user out of affiliated servers comprising steps of:

authenticating a user to visit sites on the affiliated servers by an authentication server associated with the affiliated servers;

providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user, wherein as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers are stored by the browser;

selecting, by the user via the browser, a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any site that the user has visited on the affiliated servers or the authentication server following the authentication;

receiving the selection of the logout link at the authentication server;

generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers;

providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser;

rendering the logout page on the browser of the user;

in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page by the browser, generating a plurality of image requests by the browser during rendering of the logout page based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie, each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers;

sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser;

in response to sending the image requests, receiving at the browser from each affiliated server receiving the image request, an image identified by the image request and cookie setting information;

changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication;

completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None